



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,994	09/06/2006	Frederick William Hanna	1817-0169PUS1	5596
2292 7590 12/22/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K				
ART UNIT 3628		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/22/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/571,994

**Applicant(s)**

HANNA, FREDERICK WILLIAM

**Examiner**

AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE

**Art Unit**

3628

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 58-108 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-108 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/06

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. Due to communications filed 9/6/06, the following is a non-final first office action. Due to a pre-amendment filed 3/15/06, claims 1-57 have been cancelled. Claims 58-108 have been added. Claims 58-108 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. Claims 58-108 are rejected as follows.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "when necessary" in claim 77 is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite. The term "when necessary " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Because the term "when necessary" is used, the entire claim and the scope of the invention unclear.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US 6,026,375), and further in view of Buettgenbach et al (US 2002/0032613 A1).

As per claims 58, 93, 101, Hall et al discloses:

(a) a delivery request being sent to the scheduling computer, (a)transmitting a delivery request... (col. 8, lines 50-60, if customer has MCPE capability ,all requests are handled by PAA [personal assistant agent], w/ col. 2,lines 62-67, receiving order information);

(b) the scheduling computer generating a text message according to the delivery request; (col. 5,lines 48-55MCPE is analogous to a cell phone, PDA, therefore text messaging is suggested)

(c)transmitting the text message to the customer communications device requesting confirmation or otherwise of acceptance of proposed delivery at a designated delivery location, (a) the customer communications device receiving a text message from the remote scheduling computer... (col. 2, line 67-col. 3, line 2, receiving customer location information and identifying a facility capable of completing order);

(e) updating scheduling information for the LCD according to the response from the customer communications device and sending the scheduling information to the LCD and the customer communications device by a further confirmation text

message giving delivery details including earliest estimated delivery time, (b) receiving scheduling information for the remote scheduling computer...(col. 5, lines 23-27, schedule completion of order to coincide with customer arrival); and

(f) at a pre-determined initial time, prior to the earliest estimated delivery time, the geographic location of the customer communications device is determined and depending on the distance between the customer communications device and the delivery location an initial delivery text message is sent, cancelling or confirming the delivery, (c) at a predetermined initial time prior to the earliest estimated delivery time, the customer communications device receives an initial delivery text message...(c) at a predetermined initial time, prior to the earliest estimated delivery time, an initial delivery text message, either cancelling or confirming the delivery...(Col. 3, lines 2-10, determining which facility is capable of completing order within a predetermined window of time coincided with customer arrival at determined facility, w/col. 9, lines 52-56, order cancelled based on facility location, w/ col. 9, lines 57, confirms order).

Hall et al does not specifically disclose (d) receiving a response to the text message from the customer communications device, (b) transmitting a response to the text message... however does suggest text messaging through use of MPCE capability for handling requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses methods and systems for the physical delivery of goods ordered through an electronic network where a response to a specific request/info is available through a pager in [0092].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive a response to the text message from the customer communications device with the motivation of showing a request results in some type of reaction.

As per claims 59, 94, Hall et al discloses:

in which when the text message is sent, the cancellation or confirmation of the delivery will be carded out at a predetermined future time, unless a text message from the customer communications device is received prior to that time to cause the decision regarding the delivery to be cancelled/in which a further delivery text message is received at a predetermined future..., (Col. 3, lines 2-10, determining which facility is capable of completing order within a predetermined window of time coincided with customer arrival at determined facility, w/col. 9, lines 52-56, order cancelled based on facility location).

As per claims 61, 103 Hall et al does not specifically disclose in which, for the LCD, there is stored by the scheduling computer, delivery rules established by the LCD detailing the conditions under which the delivery will be handled/in which the method further comprises the initial step of the LCD establishing delivery rules..., however does suggest text messaging through use of MPCE capability for handling requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses methods and systems for the physical delivery of goods ordered through an electronic network where conditions of deliveries are presented as shown in [0073]. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which, for the LCD, there is stored by the scheduling computer, delivery rules established by the LCD detailing the conditions under which the delivery will be handled.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the LCD, there is stored by the scheduling computer, delivery rules established by the LCD detailing the conditions under which the delivery will be handled with the motivation of applying scheduling rules for the delivery of goods.

As per claims 62, 96, 97, 104, Hall et al discloses:

when the system includes a customer account associated with a customer and the method requires the payment of money, the customer communications device is sent a text message detailing the debiting or crediting required of the customer account; the customer communications device sends a text message confirming permission to debit or credit the account with sufficient details to allow the action take place; and the LCD carries out the necessary action in respect of the account/in which the customer communications device receives a text message detailing the debiting or crediting required.../in which the customer communications device sends the text message confirming permission.../in which the LCD transmits a payment request to the remote customer communications device..., (Col. 9, line 63-col. 10, line 5, CSA instructs PAA

via network agent to change customer for order and PAA contacts financial agent and changes the order amount to customer account).

As per claims 63, 98, Hall et al discloses:

in which the customer communications device confirms the permission directly to the network computer/in which the customer communications device sends the text message confirming permission directly to the network computer, (Col. 9, line 63-col. 10, line 5).

As per claim 64, Hall et al discloses:

in which when, prior to delivery, the customer communications device sends a text message to the scheduling computer altering the proposed delivery details, the scheduling computer cancels the delivery and carries out the method as if it were a new delivery, (abstract, and Col. 10, lines 6-12, update periodically).

As per claims 66, 100, Hall et al discloses:

in which the geographic location of a logistics company parcel service provider is monitored and depending on the distance between the parcel service provider and the delivery location an initial delivery text message is sent, cancelling or confirming the delivery/in which on the distance between the customer communications device and the parcel service provider being below a certain predetermined distance..., (Col. 3, lines 2-10, determining which facility is capable of completing order within a predetermined



window of time coincided with customer arrival at determined facility, w/col. 9, lines 52-56, order cancelled based on facility location, w/ col. 9, lines 57, confirms order).

As per claim 68, Hall et al discloses:

in which on the geographic location of the customer communications device being determined a rescheduling request is sent to at least one of the customer communications device and the LCD, (abstract, and Col. 10, lines 6-12, update periodically).

As per claims 69, 106, 107, Hall et al discloses:

in which the geographical location of both the customer communication device and the parcel service provider are monitored and on the distance between the customer communication device and the parcel service provider being below a predetermined distance a rescheduling request is sent to at least one of the customer communication device and the parcel service provider/in which on the distance between a LCD personnel and the customer communications device being below.../in which the distance between the LCD personnel and the delivery location is monitored and depending on the distance between the delivery location and the LCD personnel..., (Col. 3, lines 2-10, determining which facility is capable of completing order within a predetermined window of time coincided with customer arrival at determined facility, w/col. 9, lines 52-56, order cancelled based on facility location, w/ col. 9, lines 57, confirms order).

As per claim 70, Hall et al discloses:

in which the geographic location of the customer communications device is determined using either GPS , the phone cell system or a combination of the GPS and phone cell system dependant on the geographic location of the customer communications device, (Col. 5, lines 48-65, cellular phone/GPS)..

As per claims 71-73, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose SMS, or MMS messaging, however, the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the messaging art to use SMS and MMS messaging. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use SMS and MMS messaging with the motivation of using common messaging techniques for text messaging correspondence.

As per claims 74, 81, 82, Hall et al discloses:

in which the step of generating a text message according to the delivery request further comprises retrieving LCD scheduling information from the scheduling memory and generating the text message according to the scheduling information/ in which on receiving a customer communication device contact details, the scheduling computer stores the details in the scheduling memory for future use/ in which before retrieving the contact details from the LCD the scheduling computer attempts to retrieve the contact details from scheduling memory, (col. 6, lines 6-13, SPS includes memory).

As per claim 75, Hall et al discloses:

in which the step of generating a text message according to the delivery request further comprises retrieving LCD profile data containing the suitable and available delivery times available to the LCD to make the delivery from the scheduling memory and generating the text message according to the profile data, (claims 10-12, determining/offering customer items based on profile).

As per claim 76, 77, Hall et al discloses:  
which the scheduling computer sends the scheduling information to the LCD at predetermined intervals/ wherein the LCD requests the information from the scheduling computer when necessary, (Col. 3, lines 2-10, determining which facility is capable of completing order within a predetermined window of time coincided with customer arrival at determined facility, w/col. 9, lines 52-56, order cancelled based on facility location, w/ col. 9, lines 57, confirms order).

As per claim 78, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose in which the scheduling computer stores a log of unsuccessfully sent text messages and re-sends those text messages after a predetermined time limit, however, the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the messaging art to store a log of unsuccessfully sent text messages and re-send those text messages after a predetermined time limit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store a log of unsuccessfully sent text messages and re-send those text messages after a predetermined time limit with the motivation of utilizing a commonly used delivery report feature of devices with text messaging.

As per claim 80, Hall et al does not specifically disclose in which subsequent to receiving the delivery request from the LCD the scheduling computer retrieves the contact details for the customers communication device from the LCD, however does suggest text messaging through use of MPCE capability for handling delivery requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses using messaging to include contact information for the buyer. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which subsequent to receiving the delivery request from the LCD the scheduling computer retrieves the contact details for the customers communication device from the LCD.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to disclose in which subsequent to receiving the delivery request from the LCD the scheduling computer retrieves the contact details for the customers communication device from the LCD with the motivation of showing that contact information is used to process the delivery request.

As per claim 83, Hall et al does not specifically disclose in which the LCD sends a delivery request to the scheduling computer by sending a barcode to the scheduling

computer, however does suggest text messaging through use of MPCE capability for handling requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses methods and systems for the physical delivery of goods ordered through an electronic network where a barcode/barcode label is incorporated to help carry out the steps of the invention. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which, for the LCD, there is stored by the scheduling computer, delivery rules established by the LCD detailing the conditions under which the delivery will be handled.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which the LCD sends a delivery request to the scheduling computer by sending a barcode to the scheduling computer with the motivation of applying barcodes for the identification of goods to be delivered.

As per claims 84-86, Hall et al discloses:

in which on completion of a delivery the LCD accesses the scheduling information and updates the scheduling information/in which the updated scheduling information is sent to the scheduling computer and the scheduling computer updates its scheduling information accordingly/in which the LCD updates its profile data in the profiler in accordance with its resources, (col. 5, lines 23-27, schedule completion of order to coincide with customer arrival);

As per claim 87, Hall et al does not specifically disclose in which in sending the response to the delivery request text message the customer communication device sends a suggested delivery time and the scheduling computer checks the suggested delivery time for suitability before responding to the customer communications device, however does suggest text messaging through use of MPCE capability for handling requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses methods and systems for the physical delivery of goods ordered through an electronic network where a time is selected and expected time when deliveries are available through the system. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which in sending the response to the delivery request text message the customer communication device sends a suggested delivery time and the scheduling computer checks the suggested delivery time for suitability before responding to the customer communications device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which in sending the response to the delivery request text message the customer communication device sends a suggested delivery time and the scheduling computer checks the suggested delivery time for suitability before responding to the customer communications device with the motivation of giving the customer a delivery time option.

As per claim 88, Hall et al discloses:  
in which on the customer suggesting a further delivery time and that delivery time being suitable, the scheduling computer updates the scheduling data, (col. 5, lines 23-27, schedule completion of order to coincide with customer arrival).

As per claim 90, Hall et al does not specifically disclose in which the method further comprises the step of the scheduling computer generating a customised report for the LCD, however does suggest text messaging through use of MPCE capability for handling requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses methods and systems for the physical delivery of goods ordered through an electronic network where a customized website is used to help with delivery processing. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which the method further comprises the step of the scheduling computer generating a customised report for the LCD.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which the method further comprises the step of the scheduling computer generating a customised report for the LCD with the motivation of showing that a customer can be provided with customized delivery results.

As per claim 91, Hall et al does not specifically disclose in which at a predetermined time the scheduling computer transmits billing data to a customer communications device's network operator, however does suggest text messaging

through use of MPCE capability for handling requests as discussed above in steps (a) and (b).

However, Buettgenbach et al discloses methods and systems for the physical delivery of goods ordered through an electronic network where a process bills the user's credit card. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which at a predetermined time the scheduling computer transmits billing data to a customer communications device's network operator.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which at a predetermined time the scheduling computer transmits billing data to a customer communications device's network operator with the motivation of showing that a customer can be billed for delivery services.

6. Claims 60, 89, 92, 95, 108, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US 6,026,375), and further in view of Buettgenbach et al (US 2002/0032613 A1), and further in view of Narayan et al (US 2004/0088245 A1).

As per claims 60, 95, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose in which after the delivery has commenced and at a predetermined time prior to the estimated



delivery time, a final delivery text message is sent to the customer communications device, however the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, Narayan et al discloses that a text is used to present a final copy to the seller if shipping is not completed before the final drop off date, and alert appears in [0038] and [0051]. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al, Buettgenbach et al, and Narayan et al to disclose in which after the delivery has commenced and at a predetermined time prior to the estimated delivery time, a final delivery text message is sent to the customer communications device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which after the delivery has commenced and at a predetermined time prior to the estimated delivery time, a final delivery text message is sent to the customer communications device with the motivation of showing that some type of communication is enforced confirming delivery.

As per claims 89, 108, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose in which the method further comprises the steps of the scheduling computer generating a sub-optimal schedule for the logistics company depot and transmitting the sub-optimal schedule to the logistics company depot/in which the method further comprises the step of the LCD receiving a sub-optimal schedule... however the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, Narayan et al discloses a logistics module which includes a list of logistics scheduling in [0023] and [0046]. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al, Buettgenbach et al, and Narayan et al to disclose in which the method further comprises the steps of the scheduling computer generating a sub-optimal schedule for the logistics company depot and transmitting the sub-optimal schedule to the logistics company depot/in which the method further comprises the step of the LCD receiving a sub-optimal schedule...

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which the method further comprises the steps of the scheduling computer generating a sub-optimal schedule for the logistics company depot and transmitting the sub-optimal schedule to the logistics company depot/in which the method further comprises the step of the LCD receiving a sub-optimal schedule... with the motivation of showing that scheduling is implemented into delivery of goods.

As per claim 92, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose in which the step of generating a text message according to a delivery request further comprises inserting LC specific graphical or textual content into the message, however the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, Narayan et al discloses mapping an LC system in [0025]. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al, Buettgenbach et al, and Narayan et al to disclose in which the step of generating a text message according to a delivery request further comprises inserting LC specific graphical or textual content into

the message.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which the step of generating a text message according to a delivery request further comprises inserting LC specific graphical or textual content into the message with the motivation of meeting a certain standard.

7. Claims 65, 67, 79, 99, 102, 67, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US 6,026,375), and further in view of Buettgenbach et al (US 2002/0032613 A1), and further in view of Simon et al (6,985,871).

As per claims 65, 79, 99, 102, 67, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose in which on the initial delivery text message being sent cancelling the delivery, the method further comprises the step of the scheduling computer generating a further text message to reschedule the delivery/ in which the scheduling computer on receiving a response from the customer communication device that the proposed delivery times are unsuitable, the scheduling computer generates a further text message arranging the delivery of goods and sends the further text message to the customer communication device/in which having received a further delivery text message cancelling the delivery.../in which on receipt of the initial delivery text message cancelling the delivery.../in which on the logistics company depot determining that they cannot deliver the goods at the agreed time..., however the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, Simon et al discloses that a text is sent to find out if a user wishes to schedule a delivery, and the user can choose yes or no. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Hall et al, Buettgenbach et al and Simon et al to disclose the above limitations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to the above limitations with the motivation of giving the user the option of rescheduling.

As per claim 67, neither Hall et al nor Buettgenbach et al disclose in which on the logistics company determining that they cannot deliver the goods at the agreed time and location, the logistics company sends a reschedule request to the customer via the scheduling computer, however the combination of Hall et al and Buettgenbach et al disclose sending a text message regarding a delivery as discussed in claim 1.

However, Simon et al discloses that the system schedules if the system agrees and if not the system notifies the user and allows the user to reschedule as shown in the abstract. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Halle t al and Buettgenbach et al to disclose in which on the logistics company determining that they cannot deliver the goods at the agreed time and location, the logistics company sends a reschedule request to the customer via the scheduling computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose in which on the logistics company determining that they cannot deliver the goods at the agreed time and location, the logistics company sends a

reschedule request to the customer via the scheduling computer with the motivation of giving the user another scheduling option.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

•Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3628

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A. R. B.  
December 18, 2008

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628